

REMARKS

The Amendments

Claims 1-12 were pending in the application. Claims 1-12 have been amended to address the Examiner's rejections in the Office Action. New claims 13-22 have been added by the above amendment.

The amendments to claim 1-12 are supported by the specification at e.g. page 2, lines 7-10; page 2, lines 23-25; page 3, line 27-page 4, line 15; page 7, lines 7-12; page 8, line 10 – page 9, line 8; page 10, line 30- page 11, line 19.

New claims 13-16 depend from claims 1, 7, 10 and 12, respectively, and are supported by the original claims and the specification at e.g. page 2, line 19-20 and Figure 2.

New claims 17-22 are supported by the specification at e.g. at page 2, lines 7-10; page 2, lines 23-25; page 3, line 27-page 4, line 15; page 4, line 28-page 5, line 13; page 7, lines 7-12; page 7, lines 8-23; page 8, line 10 – page 9, line 8; page 10, line 30- page 11, line 19.

No new matter is added in any of the above amendments. Applicants believe that the amendments address the Examiner's rejections and place the claims in a form for allowance.

The Response

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed methods allegedly failed to provide a concrete, tangible and useful result. Applicants have amended claims 1-9 so that the claims now recite steps wherein data is manipulated and worked on by the user. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Pati et al. US 2002/0032530 A1. Pati et al. discloses what is referred to as the "DirectGenomics" system which is a web portal for providing customers with "genomics services" or "genomics products."

The "DirectGenomics" system disclosed in Pati et al. appears to be akin to an on-line product catalog. As currently amended, the methods of claims 1-9 are not taught by Pati et al. For


example, Pati et al., does not teach selecting a standard gene expression profile from a chemical genomic database and using correlation information related to that profile to determine a biological activity of a compound. Similarly, as currently amended, claims 10-12 directed to a system for analyzing chemical genomic data are not taught by Pati et al. In particular, Pati et al. does not disclose a system with a database comprising gene expression profiles, bioassay profiles and compound information for each of a plurality of standard compounds in the database. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims as anticipated by the Pati et al. reference be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-8 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Bassett Jr. et al., (US 6,453,241 B1). As currently amended, claims 1-8 and 10-12 are not taught by Bassett Jr. et al. Bassett Jr. et al. does not disclose a method of analyzing chemical genomic data or system that includes a database comprising gene expression profiles, bioassay profiles and compound information for each of a plurality of standard compounds in the database. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims as anticipated by the Pati et al. reference be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the application is in good and proper condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 463-8133.

Respectfully submitted,



Adam K. Whiting (Reg. No. 44,400)

Date: June 9, 2004

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP
301 Ravenswood Avenue
Box 34
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 463-8133